arXiv:1610.09202v1 [math.CA] 28 Oct 2016

SUFFICIENT CONDITIONS FOR EXISTENCE OF POSITIVE PERIODIC SOLUTION OF A GENERALIZED NONRESIDENT COMPUTER VIRUS MODEL

ANÍBAL CORONEL, FERNANDO HUANCAS, MANUEL PINTO

Abstract. In this paper, we introduce a nonresident computer virus model and prove the existence of at least one positive periodic solution. The proposed model is based on a biological approach and is obtained by considering that all rates (rates that the computers are disconnected from the Internet, the rate that the computers are cured, etc) are time dependent real functions. Assuming that the initial condition is a positive vector and the coefficients are positive $\omega-$periodic and applying the topological degree arguments we deduce that generalized nonresident computer virus model has at least one positive $\omega-$periodic solution. The proof consists of two big parts. First, an appropriate change of variable which conserves the periodicity property and implies the positive behavior. Second, a reformulation of transformed system as an operator equation which is analyzed by applying the continuation theorem of the coincidence degree theory.

1. Introduction

In the last decades, the study of widespread infection of the computers connected to internet has attracted the interest of several researchers (see for instance [3, 6, 9–14, 22–26]). It is well known that the first appearance of computer viruses occurs in 1980 and the formalization of the computer virus problem and the related concepts were developed and presented independently by Solomon [34] and Cohen [4, 5]. Afterwards, many studies with diverse themes, but focused on the problem. In a broad sense, the unification of these works is that the main effort is the development of mathematical models. However, the difference is the theoretical basis of the models are disperse and diverse, since are constructed following the existing analogies with other traditional approaches (Markov chains [1, 2], graph theory [15, 16], dynamical systems [17, 18, 21, 27, 31–33, 37, 39, 40, 42–44]) of the epidemiological analysis on large populations.

Kephart and White, following the ideas suggested by Cohen [5] and Murray [22], introduce the first propagation model of computer virus in [19] (see also [20]). The assumptions given in [19] permits the dynamic modelling under deterministic models based on differential equations and stochastic models based on Markov chains. However, in [19] there is not a clear distinction when stochastic or deterministic approaches are the most preferable to describe the dynamics of computer virus spreading. Since the work of Billings et al. [2] and Amador and Artalejo [1], these facts are clearly disembowel and, roughly speaking, the stochastic models are more

Key words and phrases. Computer viruses model, periodic solutions,positive solutions.

accurate in the case of local network of small or moderate size and the deterministic models in the case of the Internet. More specific differences on stochastic and deterministic points of view are listed on [1].

In this paper, we are interested in the deterministic model proposed by for nonresident virus propagation. We recall that a nonresident virus is conceptually defined as the virus which does not store or execute itself from the computer memory. Yang et al. [37, 43] proposed the model considering two consecutive phases: (i) *The latent phase,* in which the virus has not yet been loaded into memory and the infected computer can infect other computers through file transmission or web browsing; and (ii) *The attack phase,* in which the virus has been run and the infected computer can infect other computers through infecting new hosts when those files are accessed by other programs or the operating system itself. Indeed, following the ideas and the notation of [43], let us consider that the varying total numbers of computers in the network are further divided at any time t into three compartments denoted by $S(t), L(t)$ at $A(t)$. Here, $S(t)$ denotes the average numbers of uninfected computers (susceptible computers) at time t, $L(t)$ denotes the average numbers of infected computers (latent computers) in which viruses are not yet loaded in their memory at time t; and $A(t)$ denotes the average numbers of infected computers (infectious computers) in which viruses are located in memory at time t. Thus, assuming that the following hypotheses [23]:

(H1) All newly accessed computers are virus-free.
(H2) All viruses staying in computers are nonresident.
(H3) External computers are accessed to the Internet at positive constant number b at each time t, and the uninfected, latent computers and infectious computers of internal computers are disconnected from the Internet also at rates μ_1, μ_2, and μ_3, respectively at each time t.
(H4) Users of latent computers cannot perceive the existence of virus, so latent computers cannot get cured.
(H5) The numbers of internal computers infected at time t increases by $\beta_1 SL + \beta_2 SA$, where β_1 and β_2 are positive constants.
(H6) Nonresident viruses within latent computers are loaded into memory at positive constant rate γ_1, and nonresident viruses within infectious computers transfer control to the application program at positive constant rate γ_2.
(H7) Latent computers are cured at positive constant rate γ_1, whereas infected computers are cured at positive constant rate γ_2.
(H8) α_1 and α_2 are the rates of nonresident viruses within latent computers are loaded into memory and nonresident viruses within infectious computers transfer control to the application program, respectively.

holds, the following ordinary differential equation system

$$\frac{dS(t)}{dt} = b - \mu_1 S(t) - \beta_1 S(t)L(t) - \beta_2 S(t)A(t) + \gamma_1 L(t) + \gamma_2 A(t), \quad (1.1a)$$

$$\frac{dL(t)}{dt} = \beta_1 S(t)L(t) + \beta_2 S(t)A(t) + \alpha_2 A(t) - [\mu_2 + \alpha_1 + \gamma_1]L(t), \quad (1.1b)$$

$$\frac{dA(t)}{dt} = \alpha_1 L(t) - [\mu_3 + \alpha_1 + \gamma_2]A(t), \quad (1.1c)$$

is deduced as mathematical model for nonresident computer virus propagation with varying total numbers of computers in the network.

Recently, in [23] considering that the initial condition $(S(0), L(0), A(0)) \in \mathbb{R}^3_+$ and all parameters $b, \alpha_i, \beta_i, \mu_i$ and γ_i with $i = 1, 2, 3$, are all real positive constants with $\mu_1 \leq \min\{\mu_2, \mu_3\}$, the authors prove the global stability of (1.1) establishing that there is two dynamical globally asymptotic stability possibilities: converging to an uninfected or infected equilibrium, depending if the reproduction number R_0 is such that $R_0 \leq 1$ or $R_0 > 1$, respectively. Moreover, other properties of the model (1.1) and close models based on biological models are studied in several works and also some modifications of the model are proposed recently (see for instance [24–26, 28–30, 35, 36, 38, 41, 45]). However, there are some other properties of the dynamical phenomena which are well established in epidemiological models, but are not analyzed yet for (1.1). For instance, in the best of our knowledge, there is not a result for the existence of positive periodic solutions (see [7] for a Hepatitis model).

In this paper, we consider all rates are time dependent, i.e. the assumptions on (H3), (H5)-(H8) are more general in the sense that the parameters $b, \alpha_i, \beta_i, \mu_i$ and γ_i with $i = 1, 2, 3$, are time dependent real functions. These new considerations motivate the following generalized model:

$$\begin{aligned}
\frac{dS(t)}{dt} &= b(t) - \mu_1(t)S(t) - \beta_1(t)S(t)L(t) \\
&\quad -\beta_2(t)S(t)A(t) + \gamma_1(t)L(t) + \gamma_2(t)A(t), && \text{(1.2a)} \\
\frac{dL(t)}{dt} &= \beta_1(t)S(t)L(t) + \beta_2(t)S(t)A(t) \\
&\quad +\alpha_2(t)A(t) - [\mu_2(t) + \alpha_1(t) + \gamma_1(t)]L(t), && \text{(1.2b)} \\
\frac{dA(t)}{dt} &= \alpha_1(t)L(t) - [\mu_3(t) + \alpha_1(t) + \gamma_2(t)]A(t). && \text{(1.2c)}
\end{aligned}$$

Now, in order to understand the dynamics we study the existence of positive periodic solution for (1.2).

The main result of the paper is given by the following theorem:

Theorem 1.1. *Assume that the coefficients of the system* (1.2) *satisfy the following hypothesis:*

$$\left.\begin{array}{c} \text{The initial condition } (S(0), L(0), A(0)) \in \mathbb{R}^3_+ \text{ and the coefficient functions} \\ b, \mu_1, \beta_1, \beta_2, \gamma_1, \gamma_2, \alpha_1 \text{ and } \alpha_2 \text{ are positive, continuous, } \omega\text{-periodic on } [0, \omega] \text{ and} \\ \max_{t\in[0,\omega]} \left[\frac{\alpha_1(\alpha_2+\gamma_2)}{(\alpha_1+\mu_2)}\right](t) \leq \min_{t\in[0,\omega]} (\mu_3 + \alpha_2 + \gamma_2)(t). \end{array}\right\} \quad (1.3)$$

Then, the system (1.2) *has at least one positive ω-periodic solution.*

To prove the Theorem 1.1 we apply the coincidence degree theory. The proof is self-contained and presented in section 2, by introducing several lemmas which implies that the hypotheses of continuation theorem are valid in this context. Moreover, it is worthwhile to remark that another important result of the paper is the a priory estimates given on Theorem 2.8, which is useful to get the contradiction in one of the steps of the proof of Theorem 1.1.

2. Proof of main result: Theorem 1.1

The proof is given in the following two steps

(i) We introduce a change of variable which "conservs" the periodicity property and implies the positive behavior (see Theorem 2.1).
(ii) We prove the existence of periodic solutions of the transformed system by applying the topological degree arguments.

2.1. **Reformulation of original system** (1.2)**.**

Theorem 2.1. *Assume that the system* (1.2) *has a solution. Then,* $\{S, L, A\}$ *is a solution of the system* (1.2) *if and only if* $\{S^*, L^*, A^*\}$ *defined as follows*

$$S(t) = \exp(S^*(t)), \quad L(t) = \exp(L^*(t)), \quad A(t) = \exp(A^*(t)), \tag{2.1}$$

is a solution of the following system

$$\begin{aligned}
\frac{dS^*(t)}{dt} &= b(t)\exp(-S^*(t)) - \beta_1(t)\exp(L^*(t)) - \beta_2(t)\exp(A^*(t)) \\
&\quad +\gamma_1(t)\exp\Big(L^*(t) - S^*(t)\Big) + \gamma_2(t)\exp\Big(A^*(t) - S^*(t)\Big) - \mu_1(t), && \text{(2.2a)}\\
\frac{dL^*(t)}{dt} &= \beta_1(t)\exp(S^*(t)) + \beta_2(t)\exp\Big(S^*(t) + A^*(t) - L^*(t)\Big) \\
&\quad +\alpha_2(t)\exp\Big(A^*(t) - L^*(t)\Big) - [\mu_2(t) + \alpha_1(t) + \gamma_1(t)], && \text{(2.2b)}\\
\frac{dA^*(t)}{dt} &= \alpha_1(t)\exp\Big(L^*(t) - A^*(t)\Big) - [\mu_3(t) + \alpha_2(t) + \gamma_2(t)]. && \text{(2.2c)}
\end{aligned}$$

In particular, we have that the following two assertions are valid:

(a) If the solution of the system (2.2) *is* ω*-periodic, then the solution of* (1.2) *is* ω*-periodic.*
(b) If the system (2.2) *has a solution, then* (1.2) *has a positive solution.*

Proof. We follow the proof of (2.2) by differentiation of the new variables defined on (2.1). To be more precise, let us consider that $\{S, L, A\}$ is a solution of (1.2), then we can prove that $\{S^*, L^*, A^*\}$ is a solution of (2.2) by using (2.1) and by multiplying the equations (1.2a), (1.2b) and (1.2c) by $\exp(-S^*(t))$, $\exp(-L^*(t))$ and $\exp(-A^*(t))$, respectively. Conversely, if we assume that $\{S^*, L^*, A^*\}$ is a solution of (2.2), then by (2.1) and differentiation we deduce that $\{S, L, A\}$ is a solution of (1.2). Indeed, to verify that of S satisfies (1.2a), by (2.2a) and (2.1) we have that

$$\begin{aligned}
\frac{dS(t)}{dt} &= \exp(S^*(t))\frac{dS^*(t)}{dt} \\
&= \exp(S^*(t))\Big[b(t)\exp(-S^*(t)) - \mu_1(t) - \beta_1(t)\exp(L^*(t)) \\
&\quad -\beta_2(t)\exp(A^*(t)) + \gamma_1(t)\exp(L^*(t) - S^*(t)) + \gamma_2(t)\exp(A^*(t) - S^*(t))\Big] \\
&= b(t) - \mu_1(t)S(t) - \beta_1(t)S(t)L(t) - \beta_2(t)S(t)A(t) + \gamma_1(t)L(t) + \gamma_2(t)A(t).
\end{aligned}$$

Similarly, we can verify that (1.2b) and (1.2c) are satisfied.

Assuming that the functions $\{S^*, L^*, A^*\}$ are ω-periodic, then by (2.1) we can get that the functions $\{S^*, L^*, A^*\}$ are ω-periodic, since (for instance in the case of S) we have that

$$S(t + \omega) = \exp(S^*(t + \omega)) = \exp(S^*(t)) = S(t).$$

Then (a) is proved. Now, we note that (b) is a straightforward consequence of the definition of $\{S^*, L^*, A^*\}$ given in (2.1). □

2.2. **Existence of a periodic solutions for the system** (2.2)**.** In this subsection we prove the following theorem:

Theorem 2.2. *Assume that the coefficients of the system* (2.2) *satisfy the following hypothesis* (1.3)*. Then, the system* (2.2) *has at least one* ω*-periodic solution.*

2.2.1. *The topological degree notation, concepts and results.*

In order to analyze the system (2.2) we apply the topological degree arguments. Indeed, for completeness of the presentation, we recall some notation, concepts and results of these theory (see [8] for details).

Definition 2.1. *Let* X *and* Y *be normed vector spaces and* $L : \text{Dom } L \subset X \to Y$ *a linear operator. Then,* L *is called a Fredholm operator of index zero, if the following assertions*

$$\dim(\text{Ker } L) = \text{codim}(\text{Im } L) < \infty \qquad \textit{and} \qquad \text{Im } L \textit{ is closed in } Y, \tag{2.3}$$

are valid.

Proposition 2.3. *Let* X *and* Y *be normed vector spaces and* $L : \text{Dom } L \subset X \to Y$ *a linear operator. If* L *is a Fredholm mapping of index zero, then*

(i) There are two continuous projectors $P : X \to X$ *and* $Q : Y \to Y$ *such that* $\text{Im } P = \text{Ker } L$ *and* $\text{Im } L = \text{Ker } Q = \text{Im } (I - Q)$.
(ii) $L_P := L|_{\text{Dom } L \cap \text{Ker } P} : (I - P)X \to \text{Im } L$ *is invertible and its inverse is denoted by* K_P.
(iii) There is an isomorphism $J : \text{Im } Q \to \text{Ker } L$.

Definition 2.2. *Let* X *and* Y *be normed vector spaces and* $L : \text{Dom } L \subset X \to Y$ *a Fredholm mapping of index zero. Let* $P : X \to X$ *and* $Q : Y \to Y$ *be two continuous projectors such that* $\text{Im } P = \text{Ker } L$ *and* $\text{Im } L = \text{Ker } Q = \text{Im } (I - Q)$. *Let us consider* $N : X \to Y$ *a continuous operator and* $\Omega \subset X$ *an open bounded set. Then,* N *is called* $L-$*compact on* $\overline{\Omega}$ *if* $QN(\overline{\Omega})$ *is a bounded set and the operator* $K_P(I - Q)N$ *is compact on* $\overline{\Omega}$.

Theorem 2.4. *Assume that* $(X, \|.\|_X)$ *and* $(Y, \|.\|_Y)$ *are two Banach spaces and* Ω *is an open bounded set. Consider that* $L : \text{Dom } L \subset X \to Y$ *be a Fredholm mapping of index zero and* $N : X \to Y$ *be* $L-$*compact on* $\overline{\Omega}$*. If the following hypotheses*

(C_1*)* $Lx \neq \lambda Nx$ *for each* $(\lambda, x) \in (0, 1) \times (\partial\Omega \cap \text{Dom } L)$.
(C_2*)* $QNx \neq 0$ *for each* $x \in \partial\Omega \cap \text{Ker } L$.
(C_3*)* $deg(JQN, \Omega \cap \text{Ker } L, 0) \neq 0$.

are valid. Then the operator equation $Lx = Nx$ *has at least one solution in* $\text{Dom } L \cap \overline{\Omega}$.

Definition 2.3. *Let* $\Omega \subset \mathbb{R}^n$ *be an open bounded set,* $f \in C^1(\Omega, \mathbb{R}^n) \cap C(\overline{\Omega}, \mathbb{R}^n)$ *and* $y \in \mathbb{R}^n \backslash f(\partial\Omega \cup N_f)$*, i.e.* y *is a regular value of* f*. Here,* $N_f = \{x \in \Omega : J_f(x) = 0\}$ *the critical set of* f *and* J_f *the Jacobian of* f *at* x*. Then, the degree* $\deg\{f, \Omega, y\}$ *is defined by*

$$\deg\{f, \Omega, y\} = \sum_{x \in f^{-1}(y)} \text{sgn} J_f(x),$$

with the agreement that $\sum \phi = 0$.

2.2.2. *Reformulation of* (2.2) *as an operator equation.*

Let us consider that the X and Y are two appropriate normed vector spaces and define the operators $L : \text{Dom } L \subset X \to Y$ and $N : X \to Y$

$$L\Big((x_1, x_2, x_3)^T\Big) = \left(\frac{dx_1}{dt}, \frac{dx_2}{dt}, \frac{dx_3}{dt}\right)^T \tag{2.4}$$

$$N\Big((x_1, x_2, x_3)^T\Big) = \Big(\mathcal{N}_1, \mathcal{N}_2, \mathcal{N}_3\Big)^T \tag{2.5}$$

where

$$\begin{aligned}
\mathcal{N}_1(t) &= b(t)\exp(-x_1(t)) - \mu_1(t) - \beta_1(t)\exp(x_2(t)) - \beta_2(t)\exp(x_3(t)) \\
&\quad +\gamma_1(t)\exp(x_2(t) - x_1(t)) + \gamma_2(t)\exp(x_3(t) - x_1(t)) \qquad (2.6)\\
\mathcal{N}_2(t) &= \beta_1(t)\exp(x_1(t)) + \beta_2(t)\exp(x_1(t) + x_3(t) - x_2(t)) \\
&\quad +\alpha_2(t)\exp(x_3(t) - x_2(t)) - [\mu_2(t) + \alpha_1(t) + \gamma_1(t)] \qquad (2.7)\\
\mathcal{N}_3(t) &= \alpha_1(t)\exp(x_2(t) - x_3(t)) - [\mu_3(t) + \alpha_2(t) + \gamma_2(t)]. \qquad (2.8)
\end{aligned}$$

Then, we can rewrite the system (2.2) as the following operator equation

$$L\Big((S^*, L^*, A^*)^T\Big) = N\Big((S^*, L^*, A^*)^T\Big), \quad (S^*, L^*, A^*) \in \text{Dom } L \subset X, \tag{2.9}$$

where the Banach spaces X and Y coincides and are given by

$$\begin{aligned}
X = Y = \Big\{(x_1, x_2, x_3)^T \in C(\mathbb{R}, \mathbb{R}^3) \quad &: \quad x_i(t+\omega) = x_i(t),\ i \in \{1, 2, 3\}, \\
&\Big\|(x_1, x_2, x_3)^T\Big\| = \sum_{i=1}^{3} \max_{t\in[0,\omega]} |x_i(t)| < \infty\Big\}. \qquad (2.10)
\end{aligned}$$

The spaces in (2.10) are the more appropriate, since we are interested in the study of ω-periodic solutions. Thus, the proof of existence of positive periodic solutions for 2.2 is reduced the application of Theorem 2.4 to equation (2.9), i.e. is reduced to prove that the operators L and N defined on (2.4) and (2.5) satisfy all the hypotheses of Theorem 2.4.

2.2.3. *L defined on* (2.4) *is a Fredholm operator of index zero.*

Lemma 2.5. *Let us consider X and Y the Banach spaces given on* (2.10)*. Then $L : \text{Dom } L \subset X \to Y$ defined on* (2.4) *is a Fredholm operator of index zero.*

Proof. To proof the Lemma we need to verify that the linear operator L defined on (2.4) satisfies the Definition 2.1. Indeed, we calculate Ker L and Im L. First, if we consider that $(S^*, L^*, A^*)^T \in \text{Ker } L$, then we have that $(S^*, L^*, A^*)(t) = (s_0, l_0, a_0) \in \mathbb{R}^3$ for all $t \geq t_0$ such that $(S^*, L^*, A^*)(t_0) = (s_0, l_0, a_0)$, which naturally implies that

$$\text{Ker } L \cong \mathbb{R}^3. \tag{2.11}$$

Second, if we choose $(S^*, L^*, A^*)^T \in \text{Im } L$, we have that there is $(S, L, A) \in \text{Dom } L$ such that $L\Big((S, L, A)^T\Big) = (S^*, L^*, A^*)^T$. Then, by the definition of L and the w-periodic behavior of the functions $\{S, L, A\}$, we deduce that

$$\int_t^{t+\omega} (S^*(\tau), L^*(\tau), A^*(\tau))^T d\tau = 0, \text{ for each } t \geq t_0$$

or equivalently, by the ω-periodicity of (S^*, L^*, A^*), we have that

$$\text{Im } L = \left\{ (S^*, L^*, A^*) \in Y \quad : \quad \int_0^\omega (S^*(\tau), L^*(\tau), A^*(\tau))^T d\tau = 0 \right\}. \tag{2.12}$$

Now, by the elementary results of linear algebra we have the following three relations $X \cong \text{Im } L \oplus (X/\text{Im } L)$, $X \cong \text{Ker } L \oplus (X/\text{Ker } L)$, and $\text{Im } L \cong X/\text{Ker } L$. Then, $\text{Ker } L \cong X/\text{Im } L$ and we deduce that $\dim(\text{Ker } L) = \text{codim}(\text{Im } L) = 3$. Thus the first condition in (2.3) is satisfied. Moreover, if we consider the linear continuous mapping $F : \text{Im } L \subset Y \to \mathbb{R}^3$ defined as follows

$$F\Big((x_1, x_2, x_3)^T\Big) = \left(\int_0^\omega x_1(\tau) d\tau, \int_0^\omega x_2(\tau) d\tau, \int_0^\omega x_3(\tau) d\tau \right),$$

we note that $F^{-1}\Big((0,0,0)^T\Big) = \text{Im } L$, then $\text{Im } L$ is a closed set of Y and second condition in (2.3) is also verified. □

2.2.4. *Construction of the projectors P, Q and the operator K_P.*

In this subsection we construct the projectors P, Q and K_P asociated to L, the Fredholm operator of index zero defined on (2.4), and satisfying the Proposition 2.3. Indeed, if we consider that P and Q are defined as follows

$$P\left((x_1, x_2, x_3)^T\right) = Q\left((x_1, x_2, x_3)^T\right) = \frac{1}{\omega} \int_0^\omega (x_1(\tau), x_2(\tau), x_3(\tau))^T d\tau \tag{2.13}$$

for any $(x_1, x_2, x_3) \in X$. Then, we can note that

(a) $\underline{\text{Ker } L = \text{Im } P}$. We prove this fact by double inclusion argument. First, if $(S^*, L^*, A^*)^T \in \text{Ker } L$, then by (2.11), we have that $(S^*, L^*, A^*)(t) = (s_0, l_0, a_0) \in \mathbb{R}^3$ for all $t \geq t_0$, which implies that $(S^*, L^*, A^*) \in \text{Im } P$, since for each $(s_0, l_0, a_0) \in \mathbb{R}^3$ there is $(s_0, l_0, a_0) \in X$ such that $P\Big(s_0, l_0, a_0\Big) = (s_0, l_0, a_0)$, i.e. $\text{Ker } L \subset \text{Im } P$. Conversely, if $(S^*, L^*, A^*)^T \in \text{Im } P$ we have that there is $(z_1, z_2, z_3) \in X$ such that $P((z_1, z_2, z_3)^T) = (S^*, L^*, A^*)^T$. Then by (2.13) we follow that $\omega^{-1} \int_0^\omega (z_1(\tau), z_2(\tau), z_3(\tau))^T d\tau = (S^*, L^*, A^*)$ and by differentiation we deduce that $L(S^*, L^*, A^*) = (0,0,0)$, i.e. $\text{Im } P \subset \text{Ker } L$.

(b) $\underline{\text{Ker } Q = \text{Im } L}$. We follow the proof of this equality by application of (2.12) and (2.13). Indeed, by (2.13) we have that $(S^*, L^*, A^*)^T \in \text{Ker } Q$ is equivalent to $\int_0^\omega (S^*, L^*, A^*)^T(\tau) d\tau = (0,0,0)$ and by (2.12) this equality means that $(S^*, L^*, A^*)^T \in \text{Im } L$.

(c) $\underline{\text{Im } (I - Q) = \text{Im } L}$. The proof follows by a double inclusion argument. If $(S^*, L^*, A^*)^T \in \text{Im } (I - Q)$, then there is $(z_1, z_2, z_3) \in X$ such that $(I - Q)\Big((z_1, z_2, z_3)^T\Big) = (S^*, L^*, A^*)^T$. Then, by integration and the definition of Q, given on (2.13), we have that

$$\int_0^\omega (S^*, L^*, A^*)^T(\tau) d\tau$$
$$= \int_0^\omega \left((z_1, z_2, z_3)^T(\tau) - \frac{1}{\omega} \int_0^\omega (z_1, z_2, z_3)^T(m) dm \right) d\tau = (0,0,0).$$

Thus, by (2.12) we deduce that $(S^*, L^*, A^*)^T \in \text{Im } L$, i.e. $\text{Im } (I - Q) \subset \text{Im } L$. The proof of $\text{Im } L \subset \text{Im } (I - Q)$ is analogous.

(d) Operators K_P and L_P. The operator $L_P : \text{Dom } L \cap \text{Ker } P \to \text{Im } L$ is the restriction of L to $\text{Dom } L \cap \text{Ker } P$, i.e. $L_P = L$ on $\text{Dom } L \cap \text{Ker } P$. The operator K_P, the inverse of L_P, is defined as follows

$$K_P\Big((x_1, x_2, x_3)^T\Big)(t) = \int_0^t (x_1, x_2, x_3)^T(\tau)d\tau - \frac{1}{\omega}\int_0^\omega \int_0^\eta (x_1, x_2, x_3)^T(m)dmd\eta. \quad (2.14)$$

We can prove that K_P is the inverse of L_P by application of the following fundamental relation

$$\int_0^t \frac{d}{ds}(x_1, x_2, x_3)(s)ds - \frac{1}{\omega}\int_0^\omega \int_0^t \frac{d}{dm}(x_1, x_2, x_3)(m)dmds = (x_1, x_2, x_3)(t),$$

which is valid only for all $(x_1, x_2, x_3)^T \in \text{Dom } L \cap \text{Ker } P$.

Thus, form (a), (b) and (c) we can note that the projectors P and Q defined on (2.13) satisfy the condition (i) of the Proposition 2.3 and from (d) the condition (ii) of the Proposition 2.3 is also satisfied.

2.2.5. *N defined on* (2.5) *is a continuous operator.*

Lemma 2.6. *Let us consider X and Y the Banach spaces given on* (2.10)*. Then $N : X \to Y$ defined on* (2.4) *is a continuous operator.*

Proof. Let us consider that $\{(S_n^*, L_n^*, A_n^*)\} \subset X$ an arbitrary sequence such that converges to $\{(S^*, L^*, A^*)\}$ in the norm induced topology of X. Now, using that the inequality $|1-e^{-x}| \leq x$ holds for all $x \in \mathbb{R}$, we can prove that $|e^{-a}-e^{-b}| \leq e^{-a}|a-b|$ and $|e^a - e^b| \leq e^b|a-b|$. Then, by by the definition of N given on (2.5) and by (2.5)-(2.8), we deduce that there is $C > 0$ depending on $b, \mu_1, \beta_1, \beta_2, \gamma_1, \gamma_2, \alpha_1$ and α_2 such that

$$\|N(S_n^*, L_n^*, A_n^*) - N(S^*, L^*, A^*)\| \leq C\|(S_n^*, L_n^*, A_n^*) - (S^*, L^*, A^*)\|.$$

Thus, the sequence $\{N(S_n^*, L_n^*, A_n^*)\} \subset X$ converges to $\{N(S^*, L^*, A^*)\}$ in the norm induced topology of X. Therefore, the operator N is continuous. □

2.2.6. *N defined on* (2.5) *is L-compact on any ball of X centered at* $(0, 0, 0)$.

Lemma 2.7. *Let $h \in \mathbb{R}^+$ (a fix number) and consider that $\Omega \subset X$ is the open ball of radius h and centered at* $(0, 0, 0)$*, i.e.*

$$\Omega = \{(x_1, x_2, x_3) \in X \ / \ \|(x_1, x_2, x_3)\| < h\}. \quad (2.15)$$

Moreover, consider that $L : \text{Dom } L \subset X \to Y$ and $N : X \to Y$ are the operators defined on (2.4) *and* (2.5)*, respectively. If the hypothesis* (1.3) *is satisfied, then N is L-compact on $\overline{\Omega}$.*

Proof. We prove that N, L and Ω satisfy the Definition 2.2. Indeed, firstly we note that Ω is naturally an open bounded set by construction and L is a Fredholm operator of index zero by Lemma 2.5. Second, from (2.5) and (2.13) we have that QN is defined by

$$QN((x_1, x_2, x_3)^T) = \frac{1}{\omega}\int_0^\omega (\mathcal{N}_1(\tau), \mathcal{N}_2(\tau), \mathcal{N}_3(\tau))d\tau \quad (2.16)$$

where $\mathcal{N}_i$, $i = 1, 2, 3$, denote the functions defined on (2.6)-(2.8). Moreover, for $(x_1, x_2, x_3) \in \overline{\Omega}$ and the hypothesis (1.3) we can prove that the functions $\mathcal{N}_i$ are bounded. Then, for $(x_1, x_2, x_3) \in \overline{\Omega}$ we have that

$$\|QN((x_1, x_2, x_3)^T)\| \leq \frac{1}{\omega} \int_0^\omega \|(\mathcal{N}_1, \mathcal{N}_2, \mathcal{N}_3)\| d\tau = \|(\mathcal{N}_1, \mathcal{N}_2, \mathcal{N}_3)\|$$

which implies that $QN(\overline{\Omega})$ is bounded. Finally, from (2.4), (2.5) and (2.14), we have that $K_P(I - Q)N$ is defined as follows

$$\begin{aligned}(K_P(I-Q)N)((x_1, x_2, x_3)^T)(t) \\ = \int_0^t (\mathcal{N}_1, \mathcal{N}_2, \mathcal{N}_3)(\tau) d\tau + \left(\frac{\omega^2}{2} - \frac{t}{\omega}\right) \int_0^\omega (\mathcal{N}_1, \mathcal{N}_2, \mathcal{N}_3)(\tau) d\tau \\ -\frac{1}{\omega} \int_0^\omega \int_0^\eta (\mathcal{N}_1, \mathcal{N}_2, \mathcal{N}_3)(m) dm d\eta.\end{aligned}$$

Then, we deduce that

$$\|K_P(I - Q)N\| \leq \left(\frac{\omega^2}{2} + 3\omega\right) \|N\|,$$

which implies that $(K_P(I - Q)N)(\overline{\Omega})$ is bounded, since N is bounded on $\overline{\Omega}$. Moreover, for any $t, s \in [t_0, \infty[$, we can deduce the following bound

$$|(K_P(I - Q)N)((x_1, x_2, x_3)^T)(t) - (K_P(I - Q)N)((x_1, x_2, x_3)^T)(s)| \leq 2\|N\||t - s|,$$

i.e. the operator $K_P(I - Q)N$ is equicontinuous. Thus, by application of Arzela Ascoli's theorem we have that $K_P(I-Q)N$ is a compact operator on $\overline{\Omega}$. Therefore, the operator N is L-compact on $\overline{\Omega}$. □

2.2.7. *The condition (C_1)-(C_3) of Theorem 2.4 are satisfied.*

Theorem 2.8. *Let us consider X and Y are the Banach spaces defined on* (2.10)*, Q defined by* (2.13)*, and $L : X \to Y$ and $N : X \to Y$ defined on* (2.4) *and* (2.5)*, respectively. Moreover, assume that the hypothesis* (1.3) *is satisfied. Then, there are the positive constants $\rho_1, \rho_2, \rho_3, d_1, d_2, d_3, \delta_1, \delta_2$ and δ_3, such that the following assertions are valid*

(a) *If $\lambda \in (0, 1)$ and $(x_1, x_2, x_3) \in$ Dom L are such that $L(x_1, x_2, x_3) = \lambda N(x_1, x_2, x_3)$, the following inequalities*

$$x_i(t) < \ln(\rho_i/w) + di, \quad i = 1, 2, 3, \tag{2.17}$$

$$\ln(\delta_i) < x_i(t), \quad i = 1, 2, 3, \tag{2.18}$$

holds for all $t \in [0, \omega]$.

(b) *If $(x_1, x_2, x_3) \in$ Ker L are such that $QN(x_1, x_2, x_3) = 0$, the following inequalities*

$$x_i(t) < \ln(\rho_i/w), \quad i = 1, 2, 3, \tag{2.19}$$

$$\ln(\delta_i) < x_i(t), \quad i = 1, 2, 3, \tag{2.20}$$

holds for all $t \in [0, \omega]$.

Proof. [(a)]. The proof is constructive and based on estimates for the system associated to the operator equation $L = \lambda N$. Indeed, by the definition of the operators

L and N, we notice that the system $L(x_1(t), x_2(t), x_3(t)) = \lambda N(x_1(t), x_2(t), x_3(t))$ is extensively written as follows

$$\begin{aligned}
\frac{dx_1}{dt}(t) &= \lambda\Big[b(t)\exp(-x_1(t)) - \beta_1(t)\exp(x_2(t)) - \beta_2(t)\exp(x_3(t)) \\
&\quad +\gamma_1(t)\exp\Big(x_2(t) - x_1(t)\Big) + \gamma_2(t)\exp\Big(x_3(t) - x_1(t)\Big) - \mu_1(t)\Big], \quad (2.21a)\\
\frac{dx_2}{dt}(t) &= \lambda\Big[\beta_1(t)\exp(x_1(t)) + \beta_2(t)\exp\Big(x_1(t) + x_3(t) - x_2(t)\Big) \\
&\quad +\alpha_2(t)\exp\Big(x_3(t) - x_2(t)\Big) - [\mu_2(t) + \alpha_1(t) + \gamma_1(t)]\Big], \quad (2.21b)\\
\frac{dx_3}{dt}(t) &= \lambda\Big[\alpha_1(t)\exp\Big(x_2(t) - x_3(t)\Big) - [\mu_3(t) + \alpha_2(t) + \gamma_2(t)]\Big]. \quad (2.21c)
\end{aligned}$$

By the periodicity of (x_1, x_2, x_3) we have that the integration of (2.21) on $[0, \omega]$ implies that

$$\begin{aligned}
\int_0^\omega b(t)\exp(-x_1(t))dt &= \int_0^\omega \Big[\mu_1(t) + \beta_1(t)\exp(x_2(t)) + \beta_2(t)\exp(x_3(t)) \\
&\quad -\gamma_1(t)\exp\Big(x_2(t) - x_1(t)\Big) - \gamma_2(t)\exp\Big(x_3(t) - x_1(t)\Big)\Big]dt, \quad (2.22a)\\
\int_0^\omega \Big[\beta_1(t)\exp(x_1(t)) &+ \beta_2(t)\exp\Big(x_1(t) + x_3(t) - x_2(t)\Big) \\
&\quad +\alpha_2(t)\exp\Big(x_3(t) - x_2(t)\Big)\Big]dt = \int_0^\omega \Big[(\mu_2 + \alpha_1 + \gamma_1)(t)\Big]dt, \quad (2.22b)\\
\int_0^\omega \alpha_1(t)\exp\Big(x_2(t) - x_3(t)\Big)dt &= \int_0^\omega \Big[\mu_3(t) + \alpha_2(t) + \gamma_2(t)\Big]dt. \quad (2.22c)
\end{aligned}$$

Now, taking the modulus of the equations in the system (2.21), integrating the resulting equations on $[0, \omega]$, using the fact that $\lambda \in (0, 1)$ and the equations (2.21)-(2.22), we obtain the following estimates

$$\begin{aligned}
\int_0^\omega \left|\frac{dx_1}{dt}(t)\right| dt &< 2\int_0^\omega \Big[\mu_1(t) + \beta_1(t)\exp(x_2(t)) + \beta_2(t)\exp(x_3(t))\Big]dt, \quad (2.23a)\\
\int_0^\omega \left|\frac{dx_2}{dt}(t)\right| dt &< 2\int_0^\omega \Big[\mu_2(t) + \alpha_1(t) + \gamma_1(t)\Big]dt, \quad (2.23b)\\
\int_0^\omega \left|\frac{dx_3}{dt}(t)\right| dt &< 2\int_0^\omega \Big[\mu_3(t) + \alpha_2(t) + \gamma_2(t)]\Big]dt. \quad (2.23c)
\end{aligned}$$

We note that the right hand side of (2.23b) and (2.23c) are finite as consequence of the hypothesis (1.3). Meanwhile, in order to get a finite bound of the right hand side of (2.23a) we need some finite bounds for $\int_0^\omega \exp(x_2(t))dt$ and $\int_0^\omega \exp(x_3(t))dt$.

Multiplying the equations (2.21a), (2.21b) and (2.21c) by $\exp(x_1(t)), \exp(x_2(t))$ and $\exp(x_3(t))$, respectively, and then integrating on $[0, \omega]$, we deduce that

$$\begin{aligned}
\int_0^\omega b(t)dt &= \int_0^\omega \Big[\mu_1(t)\exp(x_1(t)) + \beta_1(t)\exp(x_1(t) + x_2(t)) \\
&\quad +\beta_2(t)\exp((x_1 + x_3)(t)) - \gamma_1(t)\exp\Big(x_2(t)\Big) - \gamma_2(t)\exp\Big(x_3(t)\Big)\Big]dt, \quad (2.24a)\\
\int_0^\omega \Big[\beta_1(t)\exp(x_1(t) &+ x_2(t)) + \beta_2(t)\exp\Big(x_1(t) + x_3(t)\Big) + \alpha_2(t)\exp\Big(x_3(t)\Big)\Big]dt
\end{aligned}$$

$$= \int_0^\omega \Big[\mu_2(t) + \alpha_1(t) + \gamma_1(t)\Big] \exp(x_2(t))dt, \tag{2.24b}$$

$$\int_0^\omega \alpha_1(t) \exp\Big(x_2(t)\Big)dt = \int_0^\omega \Big[\mu_3(t) + \alpha_2(t) + \gamma_2(t)\Big] \exp(x_3(t))dt. \tag{2.24c}$$

Thus, we claim that the positive behavior and the inequality satisfied by the coefficients given on hypothesis (1.3) and the system (2.24) imply the following bounds

$$\int_0^\omega \exp(x_1(t))dt < \frac{1}{\min\limits_{t\in[0,\omega]} \mu_1(t)} \left[1 + \frac{\max\limits_{t\in[0,\omega]} \gamma_1(t)}{(1-\theta) \min\limits_{t\in[0,\omega]} (\mu_2+\alpha_1)(t)} + \frac{\theta \max\limits_{t\in[0,\omega]} \gamma_2(t)}{(1-\theta) \max\limits_{t\in[0,\omega]} (\alpha_2+\gamma_2)(t)}\right] \int_0^\omega b(t)dt, \tag{2.25a}$$

$$\int_0^\omega \exp(x_2(t))dt < \frac{1}{(1-\theta) \min\limits_{t\in[0,\omega]} (\mu_2+\alpha_1)(t)} \int_0^\omega b(t)dt, \tag{2.25b}$$

$$\int_0^\omega \exp(x_3(t))dt < \frac{\theta}{(1-\theta) \max\limits_{t\in[0,\omega]} (\alpha_2+\gamma_2)(t)} \int_0^\omega b(t)dt, \tag{2.25c}$$

where

$$\theta = \max_{t\in[0,\omega]} \left[\frac{\alpha_1}{\alpha_1+\mu_2}\right](t) \quad \frac{\max\limits_{t\in[0,\omega]} (\alpha_2+\gamma_2)(t)}{\min\limits_{t\in[0,\omega]} (\mu_3+\alpha_2+\gamma_2)(t)} \in]0,1[. \tag{2.26}$$

The fact that $\theta \in]0,1[$ is a consequence of (1.3). Now, we prove the inequalities (2.25a)-(2.25c). Indeed, firstly we prove (2.25c). By (2.24c), we note that

$$\begin{aligned}
\int_0^\omega \exp(x_3(t))dt &\leq \frac{1}{\min\limits_{t\in[0,\omega]} (\mu_3+\alpha_2+\gamma_2)(t)} \int_0^\omega (\mu_3+\alpha_2+\gamma_2)(t) \exp(x_3(t))dt \\
&= \frac{1}{\min\limits_{t\in[0,\omega]} (\mu_3+\alpha_2+\gamma_2)(t)} \int_0^\omega \alpha_1(t) \exp(x_2(t))dt \\
&= \int_0^\omega \frac{\alpha_1(t)}{(\alpha_1+\mu_2)(t)} (\alpha_1+\mu_2)(t) \exp(x_2(t))dt \\
&\leq \frac{\max\limits_{t\in[0,\omega]} \left[\frac{\alpha_1}{\alpha_1+\mu_2}\right](t)}{\min\limits_{t\in[0,\omega]} (\mu_3+\alpha_2+\gamma_2)(t)} \int_0^\omega (\alpha_1+\mu_2)(t) \exp(x_2(t))dt,
\end{aligned} \tag{2.27}$$

and by (2.24a)-(2.24b)

$$\begin{aligned}
&\int_0^\omega (\alpha_1+\mu_2)(t) \exp(x_2(t))dt \\
&= \int_0^\omega \Big[\beta_1(t) \exp(x_1(t)+x_2(t)) + \beta_2(t) \exp\Big(x_1(t)+x_3(t)\Big) \\
&\quad + \alpha_2(t) \exp\Big(x_3(t)-\gamma_1(t)\Big)\Big]dt
\end{aligned}$$

$$= \int_0^\omega \Big[b(t) + \gamma_2(t)\exp\Big(x_3(t)\Big) - \mu_1(t)\exp\Big(x_2(t)\Big) + \alpha_2(t)\exp\Big(x_3(t)\Big)\Big]dt$$
$$\leq \int_0^\omega b(t)dt + \max_{t\in[0,\omega]}(\alpha_2+\gamma_2)(t)\int_0^\omega \exp(x_3(t))dt. \tag{2.28}$$

Then, by (2.26), (2.27) and (2.28) we deduce that

$$\int_0^\omega \exp(x_3(t))dt \leq \frac{\theta}{\min\limits_{t\in[0,\omega]}(\alpha_2+\gamma_2)(t)}\int_0^\omega b(t)dt + \theta\int_0^\omega \exp(x_3(t))dt \tag{2.29}$$

which implies (2.25c). Now, from (2.28) and (2.25c) we get the following estimates

$$\begin{aligned}\int_0^\omega \exp(x_2(t))dt &\leq \frac{1}{\min\limits_{t\in[0,\omega]}(\alpha_1+\mu_2)(t)}\int_0^\omega b(t)dt \\ &\quad + \frac{\max\limits_{t\in[0,\omega]}(\alpha_2+\gamma_2)(t)}{\min\limits_{t\in[0,\omega]}(\alpha_1+\mu_2)(t)}\int_0^\omega \exp(x_3(t))dt \\ &\leq \left[\frac{1}{\min\limits_{t\in[0,\omega]}(\alpha_1+\mu_2)(t)} + \frac{\theta}{(1-\theta)\min\limits_{t\in[0,\omega]}(\alpha_1+\mu_2)(t)}\right]\int_0^\omega b(t)dt \\ &= \frac{1}{(1-\theta)\min\limits_{t\in[0,\omega]}(\alpha_1+\mu_2)(t)}\int_0^\omega b(t)dt \end{aligned}\tag{2.30}$$

and we prove (2.25b). The inequality (2.25a) is a consequence of (2.24a) and the estimates (2.25b) and (2.25c), since

$$\begin{aligned}&\int_0^\omega \exp(x_1(t))dt \\ &\quad\leq \frac{1}{\min\limits_{t\in[0,\omega]}\mu_1(t)}\int_0^\omega \mu_1(t)\exp(x_1(t)) + \beta_1(t)\exp((x_1+x_2)(t)) \\ &\qquad\qquad +\beta_2(t)\exp((x_1+x_3)(t))dt \\ &\quad\leq \frac{1}{\min\limits_{t\in[0,\omega]}\mu_1(t)}\left[\int_0^\omega b(t)dt + \int_0^\omega(\gamma_1(t)\exp(x_2(t)) + \gamma_2(t)\exp(x_3(t)))dt\right] \\ &\quad\leq \frac{1}{\min\limits_{t\in[0,\omega]}\mu_1(t)} \\ &\quad\times\left[1 + \frac{\max\limits_{t\in[0,\omega]}\gamma_1(t)}{(1-\theta)\min\limits_{t\in[0,\omega]}(\mu_2+\alpha_1)(t)} + \frac{\theta\max\limits_{t\in[0,\omega]}\gamma_2(t)}{(1-\theta)\max\limits_{t\in[0,\omega]}(\alpha_2+\gamma_2)(t)}\right]\int_0^\omega b(t)dt.\end{aligned}$$

Thus the inequalities in (2.25) are proved.

Let us introduce some notation. Given f, a positive real valued bounded function on $[0,\omega]$, we introduce the following notation

$$\overline{f} = \frac{1}{\omega}\int_0^\omega f(t)dt, \quad f^\perp = \min_{x\in[0,\omega]} f(t), \quad \text{and} \quad f^\top = \max_{x\in[0,\omega]} f(t). \tag{2.31}$$

Then by (2.25), we follow that there are the positive constants ρ_1, ρ_2 and ρ_3 given by

$$\rho_1 = \frac{\omega\overline{b}}{u_1^{\perp}}\left[1+\frac{\gamma_1^{\top}}{(1-\theta)(\mu_2+\alpha_1)^{\perp}}+\frac{\theta\gamma_2^{\top}}{(1-\theta)(\alpha_2+\gamma_2)^{\top}}\right], \tag{2.32}$$

$$\rho_2 = \frac{\omega\overline{b}}{(1-\theta)(\mu_2+\alpha_1)^{\perp}}, \tag{2.33}$$

$$\rho_3 = \frac{\theta\omega\overline{b}}{(1-\theta)(\alpha_2+\gamma_2)^{\top}}, \tag{2.34}$$

such that

$$\int_0^{\omega}\exp(x_i(t))dt < \rho_i, \quad i=1,2,3. \tag{2.35}$$

Then, by application of the intermediate value for integrals in (2.35) we get that there are $\xi_i \in [0,\omega]$ such that $x_i(\xi_i) < \ln(\rho_i/\omega)$. Thus, by the fundamental theorem of calculus and (2.23) and (2.35) we deduce that there are the positive constants d_1, d_2 and d_3 defined as follows

$$d_1 = 2[\omega\overline{\mu_1}+\beta_1^{\top}\delta_2+\beta_2^{\top}\delta_3],\ d_2 = 2\omega\,\overline{\mu_2+\alpha_1+\gamma_1},\ d_3 = 2\omega\,\overline{\mu_3+\alpha_2+\gamma_2}, \tag{2.36}$$

such that

$$x_i(t) = x(\xi_i)+\int_{\xi_i}^{t}\frac{dx}{dt}(t)dt < \ln(\rho_i/\omega)+\int_{\xi_i}^{t}\frac{dx}{dt}(t)dt < \ln(\rho_i/\omega)+d_i, \tag{2.37}$$

which implies that the inequality (2.17) is valid.

The proof of (2.18) is given as follows. For $i=1,2,3$, let us denote by $\tau_i \in [0,\omega]$ the points where x_i has a minimum, i.e. $x_1(\tau_i) = \min_{t\in[0,\omega]} x_i(t)$. Then, from (2.21) we have that

$$\begin{aligned} 0 &= b(\tau_1)\exp(-x_1(\tau_1)) - \beta_1(\tau_1)\exp(x_2(\tau_1)) - \beta_2(\tau_1)\exp(x_3(\tau_1)) \\ &\quad +\gamma_1(\tau_1)\exp\Big(x_2(\tau_1)-x_1(\tau_1)\Big) \\ &\quad +\gamma_2(\tau_1)\exp\Big(x_3(\tau_1)-x_1(\tau_1)\Big) - \mu_1(\tau_1), \qquad (2.38a) \\ 0 &= \beta_1(\tau_2)\exp(x_1(\tau_2)) + \beta_2(\tau_2)\exp\Big(x_1(\tau_2)+x_3(\tau_2)-x_2(\tau_2)\Big) \\ &\quad +\alpha_2(\tau_2)\exp\Big(x_3(\tau_2)-x_2(\tau_2)\Big) - [\mu_2(\tau_2)+\alpha_1(\tau_2)+\gamma_1(\tau_2)], \qquad (2.38b) \\ 0 &= \alpha_1(\tau_3)\exp\Big(x_2(\tau_3)-x_3(\tau_3)\Big) - [\mu_3(\tau_3)+\alpha_2(\tau_3)+\gamma_2(\tau_3)]. \qquad (2.38c) \end{aligned}$$

Now, using the notation (2.31), from (2.17) and (2.38a) we deduce the following inequalities

$$\begin{aligned} b^{\perp} &< b(\tau_1)+\gamma_1(\tau_1)\exp(x_2(\tau_1))+\gamma_2(\tau_1)\exp(x_3(\tau_1)) \\ &< \Big[\mu_1(\tau_1)+\beta_1(\tau_1)\exp(x_2(\tau_1))+\beta_2(\tau_1)\exp(x_3(\tau_1))\Big]\exp(x_1(\tau_1)) \\ &< \Big[\mu_1^{\top}+\beta_1^{\top}\exp(x_2(\tau_1))+\beta_2^{\top}\exp(x_3(\tau_1))\Big]\exp(x_1(\tau_1)) \\ &< \Big[\mu_1^{\top}+\beta_1^{\top}\frac{\rho_2}{\omega}\exp(d_2)+\beta_2^{\top}\frac{\rho_3}{\omega}\exp(d_3)\Big]\exp(x_1(\tau_1)). \end{aligned}$$

Then

$$\exp(x_1(\tau_1)) > \frac{\omega b^{\perp}}{\omega\mu_1^{\top} + \beta_1^{\top}\rho_2\exp(d_2) + \beta_2^{\top}\rho_3\exp(d_3)}. \tag{2.39}$$

Similarly, from (2.38b) and (2.38c) we get

$$\exp(x_2(\tau_2)) > \frac{\beta_1^{\perp}}{(\mu_2+\alpha_1+\gamma_1)^{\top}}, \quad \text{and} \quad \exp(x_3(\tau_3)) > \frac{\alpha_1^{\perp}}{(\mu_3+\alpha_3+\gamma_2)^{\top}}. \tag{2.40}$$

Thus, we have that there are δ_1, δ_2 and δ_3 defined by

$$\delta_1 = \frac{\omega b^{\perp}}{\omega\mu_1^{\top} + \beta_1^{\top}\rho_2\exp(d_2) + \beta_2^{\top}\rho_3\exp(d_3)}, \tag{2.41}$$

$$\delta_2 = \frac{\beta_1^{\perp}}{(\mu_2+\alpha_1+\gamma_1)^{\top}}, \tag{2.42}$$

$$\delta_3 = \frac{\beta_1^{\perp}}{(\mu_2+\alpha_1+\gamma_1)^{\top}}, \tag{2.43}$$

such that the estimate (2.18) is satisfied.

[(b)]. If $(x_1, x_2, x_3) \in \operatorname{Ker} L$, then by (2.11) we have that $(x_1, x_2, x_3) = (s_0, l_0, a_0) \in \mathbb{R}^3$ is constant. To fix ideas we consider that $(x_1, x_2, x_3) = (s_0, l_0, a_0)$. Then, by (2.16) the condition $QN((x_1, x_2, x_3)^T) = QN((s_0, l_0, a_0)^T) = 0$ implies that

$$0 = \overline{b}\exp(-s_0) - \overline{\beta_1}\exp(l_0) - \overline{\beta_2}\exp(a_0) + \overline{\gamma_1}\exp\Big(l_0 - s_0\Big) + \overline{\gamma_2}\exp\Big(a_0 - s_0\Big) - \overline{\mu_1}, \tag{2.44a}$$

$$0 = \overline{\beta_1}\exp(s_0) + \overline{\beta_2}\exp\Big(s_0 + a_0 - l_0\Big) + \overline{\alpha_2}\exp\Big(a_0 - l_0\Big) - \overline{\mu_2+\alpha_1+\gamma_1}, \tag{2.44b}$$

$$0 = \overline{\alpha_1}\exp\Big(l_0 - a_0\Big) - \overline{\mu_3+\alpha_2+\gamma_2}. \tag{2.44c}$$

Then, from the system (2.44) and by similar to the given in the case (a), we can prove that the an inequality of the type (2.35) is also valid in this case, i.e.

$$\exp(s_0) < \frac{\rho_1}{\omega}, \quad \exp(l_0) < \frac{\rho_2}{\omega} \quad \text{and} \quad \exp(a_0) < \frac{\rho_3}{\omega}.$$

which implies (2.19). Moreover, by using the fact that $\operatorname{Ker} L \subset \operatorname{Dom} L$ we have that the estimates (2.39)-(2.39) are valid for (s_0, l_0, a_0), i.e.

$$\exp(s_0) > \delta_1, \quad \exp(l_0) > \delta_2 \quad \text{and} \quad \exp(a_0) > \delta_3.$$

Thus, the inequality (2.20) is also satisfied. □

Lemma 2.9. *Let us consider X and Y are the Banach spaces defined on* (2.10)*; $\Omega \subset X$ the open ball with radius*

$$h = \sum_{i=1}^{3} \max\left\{\Big|\ln(\delta_i)\Big|, \left|\ln\left(\frac{\rho_i}{\omega_i}\right)\right| + d_i\right\} \tag{2.45}$$

with δ_i, ρ_i and d_i defined on (2.41)-(2.43)*,* (2.32)-(2.34)*, and* (2.36)*, respectively. Let Q defined by* (2.13)*, $L : X \to Y$ and $N : X \to Y$ the operators defined on* (2.4) *and* (2.5)*, respectively. Moreover, assume that the hypothesis* (1.3) *is satisfied. Then, L and N satisfy the properties (C_1)-(C_3) of Theorem 2.4.*

Proof. The proof of (C_1) and (C_2) is given by contradiction argument and the proof of (C_3) is constructive and by using the invariance property of the topological degree. More precisely, we have that

- (C_1) Let us assume that there are $\lambda \in]0,1[$ and $(x_1, x_2, x_3) \in \partial\Omega \cap \text{Dom } L$ such that $L(x_1, x_2, x_3) = \lambda L(x_1, x_2, x_3)$. Then, by application of Theorem 2.8-(a) we deduce that $(x_1, x_2, x_3) \in \text{Int } \Omega$ which is a contradiction to the assumption that $(x_1, x_2, x_3) \in \partial\Omega$.
- (C_2) Let us assume that there is $(x_1, x_2, x_3) \in \partial\Omega \cap \text{Ker } L$ such that $QN(x_1, x_2, x_3) = 0$. Then, by application of Theorem 2.8-(b) we deduce that $(x_1, x_2, x_3) \in \text{Int } \Omega$ which is a contradiction to the assumption that $(x_1, x_2, x_3) \in \partial\Omega$.
- (C_3) Let us consider the mapping $\Phi : \text{Dom } L \times [0,1] \to X$ defined as follows

$$\begin{aligned}\Phi(x_1, x_2, x_3, \epsilon) &= \begin{bmatrix} \overline{b}\exp(-x_1) - \overline{\beta_1}\exp(x_2) - \overline{\beta_2}\exp(x_3) - \overline{\mu_1} \\ \overline{\beta_1}\exp(x_1) - [\overline{\mu_2 + \alpha_1 + \gamma_1}] \\ \overline{\alpha_1}\exp(x_2 - x_3) - [\overline{\mu_3 + \alpha_2 + \gamma_2}] \end{bmatrix} \\ &\quad + \varepsilon \begin{bmatrix} \overline{\gamma_1}\exp(x_2 - x_1) + \overline{\gamma_2}\exp(x_3 - x_1) \\ \overline{\beta_2}\exp(x_1 + x_3 - x_2) + \overline{\alpha_2}\exp(x_3 - x_2) \\ 0 \end{bmatrix}.\end{aligned}$$

We prove that $\Phi(x_1, x_2, x_3, \epsilon) \neq 0$ when $(x_1, x_2, x_3)^T \in \partial\Omega \cap \text{Ker } L$. Here, by (2.11) recall that $(x_1, x_2, x_3)^T = (s_0, l_0, a_0) \in \mathbb{R}^3$ is a constant vector. Now, assuming that the conclusion is not true, then the constant vector $(s_0, l_0, a_0)^T$ with $\|(s_0, l_0, a_0)\| = h$ satisfies $\Phi(s_0, l_0, a_0, \epsilon) = 0$, that is,

$$\begin{aligned} 0 &= \overline{b}\exp(-s_0) - \overline{\beta_1}\exp(l_0) - \overline{\beta_2}\exp(a_0) \\ &\quad -\overline{\mu_1} + \varepsilon[\overline{\gamma_1}\exp(l_0 - s_0) + \overline{\gamma_2}\exp(a_0 - s_0)], \\ 0 &= \overline{\beta_1}\exp(s_0) - [\overline{\mu_2 + \alpha_1 + \gamma_1}] + \varepsilon[\overline{\beta_2}\exp(s_0 + a_0 - l_0) \\ &\quad +\overline{\alpha_2}\exp(a_0 - l_0)], \\ 0 &= \overline{\alpha_1}\exp(l_0 - a_0) - [\overline{\mu_3 + \alpha_2 + \gamma_2}]. \end{aligned}$$

Then, by similar arguments to the proof Theorem 2.8-(a) we obtain that $\|(s_0, l_0, a_0)^T\| < h$, which contradicts to the assumption that $\|(s_0, l_0, a_0)^T\| = h$.

By the Homotopy Invariance Theorem of Topology Degree, taking $J = I : \text{Im } Q \to \text{Ker } L$ such that $(x_1, x_2, x_3)^T \mapsto (x_1, x_2, x_3)^T$, using the fact that the system

$$\begin{aligned} \overline{b}e^{-x_1(t)} - \overline{\mu_1} - \overline{\beta_1}e^{x_2(t)} - \overline{\beta_2}e^{x_3(t)} + \overline{\gamma_1}e^{(x_2-x_1)(t)} + \overline{\gamma_2}e^{(x_3-x_1)(t)} &= 0 \\ \overline{\beta_1}e^{x_1(t)} + \overline{\beta_2}e^{x_1(t)+x_3(t)-x_2(t)} + \overline{\alpha_2}e^{x_3(t)-x_2(t)} - [\overline{\mu_2 + \alpha_1 + \gamma_1}] &= 0 \\ \overline{\alpha_1}e^{x_2(t_3)-x_3(t_3)} - [\overline{\mu_3 + \alpha_2 + \gamma_2}] &= 0, \end{aligned}$$

has a unique solution $(x_1^\star, x_2^\star, x_3^\star)^T \in \partial\Omega \cap \text{Ker } L$, and by definition 2.3, we have that

$$\begin{aligned} &\deg(JQN(x_1, x_2, x_3)^T, \Omega \cap \text{Ker } L, (0,0,0)^T) \\ &\quad = \deg(\Phi(x_1, x_2, x_3, 1), \Omega \cap \text{Ker } L, (0,0,0)^T) \\ &\quad = \deg\Big((\overline{b}e^{-x_1} - \overline{\beta_1}e^{x_2} - \overline{\beta_2}e^{x_3} - \overline{\mu_1}, \overline{\beta_1}e^{x_1} \\ &\qquad -[\overline{\mu_2 + \alpha_1 + \gamma_1}], \overline{\alpha_1}e^{x_2-x_3} - [\overline{\mu_3 + \alpha_2 + \gamma_2}])^T, \Omega \cap \text{Ker } L, (0,0,0)^T\Big) \end{aligned}$$

$$
\begin{aligned}
&= \operatorname{sgn}\begin{vmatrix} -\overline{b}e^{-x_1^\star} & -\overline{\beta_1}e^{x_2^\star} & -\overline{\beta_2}e^{x_3^\star} \\ \overline{\beta_1}e^{x_1^\star} & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & \overline{\alpha_1}e^{x_2^\star - x_3^\star} & -\overline{\alpha_1}e^{x_2^\star - x_3^\star} \end{vmatrix} \\
&= \operatorname{sgn}\Big[-\Big(\overline{\alpha_1}\,\overline{\beta_1}\,\overline{\beta_2}e^{x_1^\star + x_2^\star} + \overline{\alpha_1}\,\overline{\beta_1}^2 e^{x_1^\star + 2x_2^\star - x_3^\star} \Big) \Big] \\
&= -1,
\end{aligned}
$$

which implies that $\deg(JQN, \Omega \cap \operatorname{Ker} L, 0) \neq 0$ and prove that (C3) is valid. Thus, the properties (C_1)-(C_3) of the Theorem 2.4 are valid for the given operators. □

2.2.8. *Proof of Theorem 2.2.* By Lemmata 2.5, 2.6 2.7 and 2.9 we have that the hypotheses of the Theorem 2.4 are valid. Then, the operator equation (2.4) has at least one solution in $\operatorname{Dom} L \cap \overline{\Omega} \subset X$ and naturally this fact implies that the system (2.2) has at least one $\omega-$periodic solution.

2.3. **Final remarks of the proof of Theorem 1.1.** If the hypothesis 1.3 is valid, by Theorem 2.2 we have that the system (2.2) has at least one $\omega-$periodic solution. Thus, by applying the Theorem 2.1, we conclude the proof of Theorem 1.1.

Acknowledgments

A. Coronel and F. Huancas thanks for the support of research projects DIUBB GI 153209/C and DIUBB GI 152920/EF at Universidad del Bío-Bío, Chile. M. Pinto thanks for the support of FONDECYT 1120709.

References

[1] J. Amador and J.-R. Artalejo. Stochastic modeling of computer virus spreading with warning signals. J. Franklin Inst. 350(5) (2013), 1112–1138.
[2] L. Billings, W. M. Spears, and I. B. Schwartz. A unified prediction of computer virus spread in connected networks. Phys. Lett. A 297(3-4) (2002), 261–266.
[3] L. Chen, K. Hattaf, J. Sun. Optimal control of a delayed SLBS computer virus model. Phys. A 427 (2015), 244–250.
[4] F. Cohen. Computer Viruses. PhD thesis, University of Southern California (1985)
[5] F. Cohen. Computer viruses: theory and experiments. Comput. Secur. 6(1)(1987), 22–35.
[6] T. Dong, X. Liao, and H. Li. Stability and Hopf bifurcation in a computer virus model with multistate antivirus. Abstr. Appl. Anal. (2012), Art. ID 841987, 16 pp.
[7] H. Fang, M. Wang, and T. Zhou. Existence of positive periodic solution of a hepatitis B virus infection model, Math. Meth. Appl. Sci. 38 (2014), 188–196.
[8] R. Gaines, and J. Mawhin. Coincidence degree and nonlinear diffrential equations. Springer-Verlag: Berlin, 1977.
[9] Ch. Gan, X. Yang and Q. Zhu. Propagation of computer virus under the influences of infected external computers and removable storage media: modeling and analysis. Nonlinear Dynam. 78(2) (2014), 1349–1356.
[10] Ch. Gan, X. Yang, and Q. Zhu. Global stability of a computer virus propagation model with two kinds of generic nonlinear probabilities. Abstr. Appl. Anal. (2014), Art. ID 735327, 7 pp.
[11] Ch. Gan, X. Yang, W. Liu, Q. Zhu, J. Jin, and L. He. Propagation of computer virus both across the Internet and external computers: a complex-network approach. Commun. Nonlinear Sci. Numer. Simul. 19(8) (2014), 2785–2792.
[12] Ch. Gan, X. Yang, W. Liu, and Q. Zhu. A propagation model of computer virus with nonlinear vaccination probability. Commun. Nonlinear Sci. Numer. Simul. 19(1) (2014), 92–100.
[13] Ch. Gan, X. Yang, Q. Zhu, J. Jin, and L. He. The spread of computer virus under the effect of external computers. Nonlinear Dynam. 73(3) (2013), 1615–1620.

[14] Ch. Gan, X. Yang, W. Liu, Q. Zhu and X. Zhang. Propagation of computer virus under human intervention: a dynamical model. Discrete Dyn. Nat. Soc. (2012), Art. ID 106950, 8 pp.
[15] L. A. Goldberg, P. W. Goldberg, C. A. Phillips, and G. B. Sorkin. Constructing computer virus phylogenies. J. Algorithms 26(1) (1998), 188–208.
[16] L. A. Goldberg, P. W. Goldberg, C. A. Phillips, G. B. Sorkin. Constructing computer virus phylogenies. Combinatorial pattern matching (Laguna Beach, CA, 1996), 253–270, Lecture Notes in Comput. Sci., 1075, Springer, Berlin, 1996.
[17] X. Han and Q. Tan. Dynamical behavior of computer virus on Internet. Appl. Math. Comput. 217(6) (2010), 2520–2526.
[18] Z. Hu, H. Wang, F. Liao, W. Ma. Stability analysis of a computer virus model in latent period. Chaos Solitons Fractals 75 (2015), 20–28.
[19] J.-O. Kephart, and S.-R. White. Measuring and modeling computer virus prevalence. IEEE Computer Society Symposium on Research in Security and Privacy, Oakland, California, (1993), 2–15.
[20] J.-O. Kephart, S.-R. White, and D.-M. Chess . Computers and epidemiology. IEEE Spectrum 30 (1993), 20–26.
[21] T. Li. Dynamic detection for computer virus based on immune system. Sci. China Ser. F 51(10) (2008), 1475–1486.
[22] W. H. Murray. The application of epidemiology to computer viruses. Comput Secur 7(2) (1988), 130–50.
[23] Y. Muroya and T. Kuniya. Global stability of nonresident computer virus models. Math. Methods Appl. Sci. 38(2) (2015), 281–295.
[24] Y. Muroya, Y. Enatsu, and H. Li. Global stability of a delayed SIRS computer virus propagation model. Int. J. Comput. Math. 91(3)(2014), 347–367.
[25] Y. Muroya, H. Li, and T. Kuniya. On global stability of a nonresident computer virus model. Acta Math. Sci. Ser. B Engl. Ed. 34(5)(2014), 1427–1445.
[26] N. Nyamoradi, and M. Javidi. Qualitative and bifurcation analysis using a computer virus model with a saturated recovery function. J. Appl. Anal. Comput. 2(3) (2012), 305–313.
[27] M. Peng, X. He, J. Huang, and T. Dong. Modeling computer virus and its dynamics. Math. Probl. Eng. (2013), Art. ID 842614, 5 pp.
[28] J. Ren and Y. Xu. Stability and bifurcation of a computer virus propagation model with delay and incomplete antivirus ability. Math. Probl. Eng. (2014), Art. ID 475934, 9 pp.
[29] J. Ren, Y. Xu, and Ch. Zhang. Optimal control of a delay-varying computer virus propagation model. Discrete Dyn. Nat. Soc. (2013), Art. ID 210291, 7 pp.
[30] J. Ren, Y. Xu, and J. Liu. Global bifurcation of a novel computer virus propagation model. Abstr. Appl. Anal. (2014), Art. ID 731856, 6 pp.
[31] J. Ren, Y. Xu, Y. Zhang, Y. Dong, and G. Hao. Dynamics of a delay-varying computer virus propagation model. Discrete Dyn. Nat. Soc. (2012), Art. ID 371792, 12 pp.
[32] J. Ren, X. Yang, L.-X. Yang, Y. Xu, and F. Yang. A delayed computer virus propagation model and its dynamics. Chaos Solitons Fractals 45(1) (2012), 74–79.
[33] J. Ren, X. Yang, Q. Zhu, L.-X. Yang, Ch. Zhang. A novel computer virus model and its dynamics. Nonlinear Anal. Real World Appl. 13(1) (2012), 376–384.
[34] A. Solomon. A Brief History of PC Viruses. Comput Fraud Secur Bull 12 (1993), 9–19.
[35] H. Song, Q. Wang, and W. Jiang. Stability and Hopf bifurcation of a computer virus model with infection delay and recovery delay. J. Appl. Math. (2014), Art. ID 929580, 10 pp.
[36] J.-C. Wierman, and D.-J. Marchette. Modeling computer virus prevalence with a susceptible-infected-susceptible model with reintroduction. Comput. Statist. Data Anal. 45(1) (2004), 3–23.
[37] L.-X. Yang, X. Yang, Y.-Y. Tang. Qualitative analysis of a nonresident computer virus model. Preprint.
[38] X. Yang, B. Liu, and C. Gan. Global stability of an epidemic model of computer virus. Abstr. Appl. Anal. (2014), Art. ID 456320, 5 pp.
[39] L.-X. Yang, X. Yang, L. Wen, and J. Liu. A novel computer virus propagation model and its dynamics. Int. J. Comput. Math. 89(17) (2012), 2307–2314.
[40] M. Yang, Z. Zhang, Q. Li, and G. Zhang. An SLBRS model with vertical transmission of computer virus over the Internet. Discrete Dyn. Nat. Soc. (2012), Art. ID 925648, 17 pp.

[41] Z. Zhang, and H. Yang. Hopf bifurcation analysis for a computer virus model with two delays. Abstr. Appl. Anal. (2013), Art. ID 560804, 18 pp.
[42] Z. Zhang and H. Yang. Hopf bifurcation of an SIQR computer virus model with time delay. Discrete Dyn. Nat. Soc. (2015), Art. ID 101874, 8 pp.
[43] L.-X. Yang, X. Yang, Q. Zhu, and L. Wen. A computer virus model with graded cure rates. Nonlinear Anal. Real World Appl. 14(1) (2013), 414–422.
[44] Q. Zhu, X. Yang, and J. Ren. Modeling and analysis of the spread of computer virus. Commun. Nonlinear Sci. Numer. Simul. 17(12) (2012), 5117–5124.
[45] Q. Zhu, X. Yang, L.-X. Yang, and Ch. Zhang. Optimal control of computer virus under a delayed model. Appl. Math. Comput. 218(23) (2012), 11613–11619.

Aníbal Coronel
GMA, Departamento de Ciencias Básicas, Facultad de Ciencias, Universidad del Bío-Bío, Campus Fernando May, Chillán, Chile
E-mail address: acoronel@ubiobio.cl

Fernando Huancas
GMA, Departamento de Ciencias Básicas, Facultad de Ciencias, Universidad del Bío-Bío, Campus Fernando May, Chillán, Chile
E-mail address: fihuanca@gmail.com

Manuel Pinto
Departamento de Matemáticas, Facultad de Ciencias, Universidad de Chile, Chile,
E-mail address: pintoj.uchile@gmail.cl